



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,270	07/10/2003	Michael Charles Grady	FA1106USNA	2476

  

23906	7590	02/06/2008
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY		
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER		
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1122B		
4417 LANCASTER PIKE		
WILMINGTON, DE 19805		

  

EXAMINER
ASINOVSKY, OLGA

  

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1796	

  

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/06/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10617270	7/10/03	GRADY, MICHAEL CHARLES	FA1106USNA

**EXAMINER**

Olga Asinovsky

**ART UNIT****PAPER**

1796

20080130

**DATE MAILED:**

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

The Examiner's Answer for Application Number: 10/617,270 is returning from Appeal Specialist to Examiner on 19-January-2008. Because the ground of rejection is not consistent with the final rejection dated 6/23/05, claims (9&22 were added). Claims 9&22 were inattentive missing in the final rejection, page 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection. Each, claim 9 and claim 22 is depending on claim 1. The hybrid reactor (claim 1) is a stirred tank reactor (claim 9) and a batch reactor (claim 22). The same reactor having different name. The evidence that claims 9 and 22 have been considered in the final office action is at page 5, line 1, and, wherein batch reactor is hybride reactor in applicant's claim 1. The examiner apologies for missing claims 9&22 in the final office action.

**RANDY GULAKOWSKI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700**